

### REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending applications. The final Office Action dated February 28, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, independent claims 1, 8 and 11 are amended. Further, claim 5 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-15, and 19-23 are currently being examined. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-15 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0152658 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter “Ozawa ‘658’”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,062 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter “Ozawa ‘062’”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0171792 to Kubota et al. (hereinafter “Kubota ‘792’”)

Applicants traversed the rejection because none of the cited prior art, including Ozawa, suggests the desirability of the claimed invention.

Independent amended claim 1 recites a trans-reflective liquid crystal display device, in part, comprising “the sequential backlight is disposed under the TFT array substrate.” Also, independent amended claim 8 recites a method of driving a trans-reflective liquid crystal display device having a plurality of pixels, comprising “disposing a sequential backlight having red, green, and blue light lamps under the trans-reflective liquid crystal display device.” Furthermore, independent amended claim 11 recites a liquid crystal display device, comprising “the sequential backlight is disposed under the TFT array substrate.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Ozawa ‘658 and Ozawa ‘062 fail to disclose that the backlight is a sequential backlight including red, green, and blue lamps, and a backlight controller connected to the sequential backlight to control the timing of light emissions in the transmission mode. The Examiner asserts that Kubota explicitly teaches a sequential backlight including red, green, and blue lamps (Paragraph [0089]).

But, Kubota discloses that a light-emitting diode (LED) is disposed at the side of the array substrate and light emitted from the light source propagates through a light guiding plate, passes through optical films. The claimed invention discloses that sequential backlight including red, green, and blue lamps and is disposed under the TFT array substrate. Accordingly, the claimed invention is different from Kubota in that the structure of the sequential backlight is disposed at the side of an array substrate.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozawa '658, Ozawa '062 and Kubota fail to teach or suggest that the sequential backlight comprising is disposed under the TFT array substrate.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: 28 May 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant